



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/554,133

10/20/2005

Clifford J Herman

1332 WO/US

9352

7590

09/25/2008

Jeffrey S Boone
Mallinckrodt Inc
675 McDonnell Boulevard
PO Box 5840
St Louis, MO 63134

EXAMINER

CLAYTOR, DEIRDRE RENEE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/554,133	Applicant(s) HERMAN, CLIFFORD J	
	Examiner Renee Claytor	Art Unit 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/16/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicants argue over the 35 USC 103 rejection that Midha et al. and Epstein et al., both alone and in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a storage stable solution comprising methylphenidate and a solvent system in which the water concentration is less than 50%.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are not persuasive. Applicants make the argument that Midha and Epstein are not concerned with storage stability or shelf life. This is not persuasive because the claims are drawn to a composition comprised of methylphenidate, an organic acid and a solvent system in which Midha and Epstein render the composition obvious because it is comprised of the same elements. Because the prior art meets the claim limitation, it would be obvious that storage stability would occur because the composition is comprised of the same

Art Unit: 1617

elements. Furthermore, it is obvious to vary and/or optimize the amounts of methylphenidate, organic acid and aqueous and non-aqueous solvents provided in the composition, according to the guidance provided by Midha et al. and Epstein et al. to provide a composition having the desired properties such as the desired concentrations and percentages of each component to formulate an effective methylphenidate solution for administration. There is no indication that varying amounts of water or the solvent system would interfere with storage stability as indicated by Applicants absent a showing of unexpected results. The Declaration provided does not show results that compositions comprising more than 10-45% of water as claimed would provide a composition that is not storage stable. In view of applicants amendments to the claims, the following modified non-final rejection is made.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Midha et al. (US Patent 6,127,385) in view of Epstein et al. (US Pg-Pub 2002/0103162).

Midha et al. teach solutions comprised of methylphenidate that is dissolved in an aqueous or non-aqueous solvent such as propylene glycol and an organic acid such as ascorbic acid (Col. 4, lines 59-63). The solution further contains aromatic oils as flavoring agents (Col. 4, lines 59-63). Midha et al. further teach that injectable solutions may be prepared using water (Col. 5, lines 21-23).

Midha et al. do not teach the amounts of each component listed, the specific polyols listed in claims 11, 16 and 21 or the glycol listed in claim 22.

Epstein et al. teach pharmaceutical preparations comprised of methylphenidate compounds. It is taught that the preparations may be formulated in a biologically acceptable medium, such as water (solvent) and polyols (non-aqueous solvent; with glycerin, sorbitol and polyethylene glycol listed) and mixtures thereof (meeting the limitations of polyols in claims 11, 16 and 21; paragraph 0250 and 0268). It is further taught that antioxidants may be present in the composition, with citric acid being amongst the possible antioxidants listed (paragraph 0274). Epstein et al. also teach the use of flavoring agents (paragraph 0273).

Regarding the limitation that the composition is storage stable, it is obvious that because the prior art teaches compositions comprised of the same components. Therefore, the property of being storage stable would obviously be the same absent a showing of unexpected results.

Furthermore, it is obvious to vary and/or optimize the amounts of methylphenidate, organic acid and aqueous and non-aqueous solvents provided in the composition, according to the guidance provided by Midha et al. and Epstein et al. to

Art Unit: 1617

provide a composition having the desired properties such as the desired concentrations and percentages of each component to formulate an effective methylphenidate solution for administration. It is noted that “[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.” In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955).

Accordingly, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Midha et al., which teach pharmaceutical solutions comprised of methylphenidate and an organic acid dissolved in propylene glycol and water, with the teachings of Epstein et al. which teach methylphenidate preparations as well and include citric acid as an organic acid that can be used in the composition, as well as a solvent and non-aqueous solvents. One would be motivated to use the citric acid taught by Epstein et al. in the composition of Midha et al. because Midha et al. teach solutions comprised of organic acids and there would be a reasonable expectation of success that citric acid would be effective in the composition as taught by Epstein et al.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Renee Claytor whose telephone number is (571)272-8394. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Renee Claytor

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617